

No. 7755-4Lab-72/30442.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Grover Enterprise, Kundli (Rohtak).

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 148 of 1972

between

SHRI MEHAR SINGH AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S GROVER ENTERPRISE, KUNDLI (ROHTAK)

Present.—

Nemo, for the applicant.

Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

The Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, was pleased to refer the following dispute to this court for adjudication,—*vide Government Gazette* notification No. ID/RK/189-A-72/14793-97, dated 18th April, 1972 :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Mehar Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

On receipt of the reference usual notice was issued to the parties for 10th July, 1972. The service of the workman has been affected but he has not appeared in the court. Only a letter purporting to have been sent by the workman has been received in which it is alleged that the workman has settled his claims and received all his wages and other payments whatsoever due from the management and he has no further claim against them. Since the workman not appeared to enable the court to proceed further with the case and in view of the letter received from the Workman, I hold that he is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated 10th July, 1972.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No 1251, dated 11th July, 1972

Forwarded (4 copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 7748-4Lab-72/30444.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Metal Box Co. of India Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 140 of 1970

Between

SHRI BHIM SINGH AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S METAL BOX CO. OF INDIA LTD., FARIDABAD

Prerent.—

Shri Bhim Singh applicant in person.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

The Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 0 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was pleased to refer the following dispute to this court for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government Gazette notification No. 124-SF-IV-Lab-66/3521, dated 24th November, 1966:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Bhim Singh was justified and in order ? If not; to what relief is he entitled ?

The management filed a Civil Writ objecting to the Validity of the reference on the ground that the Government has once refused to make the reference and it could not revised its decision. The proceedings in the Labour Court remained stayed on this ground. Ultimately the writ was dismissed and the proceedings started. The Labour Court ceased to function by reason of the judgement given by the High Court in Civil Writ No. 1129, dated 2nd September, 1969 filed by M/s Gedore Tools India (P) Ltd., Faridabad. The Government of Haryana constituted the present Labour Court by Gazette notification No. 3864-ASO(E)-Lab-70, dated 8th May, 1970 and referred all the pending disputes including the present dispute to this court for adjudication,—vide Government Gazette notification No. 6091-E-Lab-70/22387, dated 31st July, 1970.

It is, however not necessary to decide the case on merits because a compromise marked Exhibit M/1 has been arrived at between the parties. The workman has given up his claim for re-instatement or re-employment and has accepted a sum of Rs 3,499 in full and final settlement of all his claims. The management have made the payment of this amount to the workman by cross-cheque. Accordingly, I give my award as per terms of compromise. No order as to costs.

Dated : The 10th July, 1972.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 1259, dated Rohtak, the 11th July, 1972.

Forwarded (4 copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 7753-4Lab-72/30446.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Hari Narayan Metal Industries, Jagadhri.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRISIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 75 of 1972

Between

SHRI RAM DHARI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARI NARAYAN METAL INDUSTRIES,
JAGADHRI

Present :

Shri Madhu Sudan Saran Kaushish for the applicant.

Shri D. S. Rekhi for the management.

AWARD

The Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, was pleased to refer the following dispute to this Court for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government Gazette notification No. Amb/212-B-71/7317, dated 27th July, 1972 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Dhari was justified and in order ? If not; to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties. The position taken by the management is that the applicant had never been in their services. Accordingly the following issues were framed :—

(1) whether the applicant was in the service of M/s Hari Narayan Metal Industries, Jagadhri ?

(2) If the above issue is proved to what relief is he entitled ?

Shri Madhu Sudan Saran Kaushish who represents the workman has made a statement that he has no instructions from the workman to proceed further. The workman has not produced any evidence to prove that he has been in the service of the respondent. The onus of this issue was on the workman. I, therefore, find this issue against the workman and held that he is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to the costs.

Dated : The 11th July, 1972.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 1249, dated Rohtak, the 11th July, 1972.

Forwarded (4 copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 7754-4Lab-72/30448.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s S. B. Industries, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 9 of 1972

Between

SMT. MUNNI DEVI, C/O INDUSTRIAL WORKERS UNION, REGD., FARIDABAD AND THE
MANAGEMENT OF M/S S. B. INDUSTRIES, FARIDABAD

Present :

Nemo for the workman.

Shri B. R. Grover for the management.

AWARD

The Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was pleased to refer the following dispute to this Court for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government Gazette notification No. ID/FD/764-A-71/353, dated 5th January, 1972 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Munni Devi was justified and in order ? If not ; to what relief is she entitled ?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties, in response to which the management filed their written statements. It was pleaded by the management that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled. A copy of the settlement has also been filed. The representative of the workman had no instructions regarding the settlement. So the workman was ordered to appear in person but she has not attended. The management have pleaded that the workman left the job on her own accord and she has been taken back on duty afresh and now there is no dispute between the parties. In view of the settlement between the parties, I hold that the workman is not entitled to any further relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

Dated : 10th July, 1972

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 1250, dated Rohtak, the 11th July, 1972.

Forwarded (4 copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.